Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 1 of 12

SEP 17 2013

CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
Central District of California
BY moser DEPUTY CLERK

# UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### RIVERSIDE DIVISION

In re:

Case No. 6:12-bk-28006 MJ

CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA

Chapter 9

COURT'S STATEMENT OF UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Hearing Held: August 28, 2013 Time: 1:30 p.m.

On July 5, 2013, debtor City of San Bernardino, California (the "City") filed its motion for summary judgment seeking an order determining that it is eligible for relief under chapter 9 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§109(c), 921(c) and 921(d) (the "Eligibility Motion") and supporting papers. On August 5, 2013, the California Public Employees' Retirement System ("CalPERS") filed its opposition to the Eligibility Motion and supporting papers. On August 16, 2013, the City filed its reply and supporting papers. A hearing was held on the Eligibility Motion on August 28, 2013.

By separate orders, the Court has determined that the City is entitled to summary judgment on the Eligibility Motion, and that that an order for relief under chapter 9 should be entered. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, made applicable to bankruptcy proceedings by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7056 and 9014, the Court hereby adopts the following Statement of Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusions of Law

concerning the City's petition and eligibility for chapter 9 relief in support of the grant of the City's Summary Judgment Motion.

# **UNCONTROVERTED FACTS**

	I
<b>Uncontroverted Facts</b>	Evidence
1. The City is a California municipal corporation operating under a city charter ratified by its voters.	Ex. A to Declaration of Georgeann Hanna In Support of City of San Bernardino's Memorandum of Facts and Law in Support of the Statement of Qualifications Under Section 109(c) of the Bankruptcy Code ("Hanna Decl.") [Docket No. 129]
2. The City is a municipality.	The evidence in paragraph 1 above and that no party objected to eligibility on Section 109(c)(1) grounds.
3. The City placed items on the agenda for the July 10, 2012 noticed public meeting of the Mayor and Common Council that there would be discussion on the City's budget for the fiscal year 2012/2013 and possible action on authorizing the filing of a petition under Chapter 9.	Hanna Decl., Exhibit D; Declaration of Andrea Travis-Miller in Support of City of San Bernardino's Memorandum of Facts and Law in Support of the Statement of Qualifications Under Section 109(c) of the Bankruptcy Code [Docket No. 126] ("Travis-Miller Decl."), ¶ 7.
4. A report was prepared entitled the "San Bernardino Budgetary Analysis and Recommendations for Budget Stabilization" dated July 9, 2012 (the "Budget Report").	Exhibits B and C to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller Decl. at ¶ 6.
5. At the July 10, 2012 noticed public meeting of the Mayor and Common Council, the Budget Report concerning the fiscal condition of the City was presented and the meeting was open for public comments.	Hanna Decl. Exhibits B and C; Travis-Miller Decl., ¶ 8; Busch Decl., ¶ 13.
6. The City placed items on the agenda of the July 16, 2012 noticed public meeting of the Mayor and Common Council for discussion concerning a declaration of fiscal emergency in the City and taking possible action on authorizing the filing of a petition under Chapter 9.	Exhibit E to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller Decl., ¶ 9.
7. The July 16, 2012 meeting of the Mayor and Common Council was open for public comments and was adjourned and continued to July 18, 2012. A presentation was made on the city's financial crisis at that meeting.	Exhibit F to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller Decl., ¶ 9.

# Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 12

1		
	<b>Uncontroverted Facts</b>	Evidence
2 3	8. The City placed items on the agenda of the July 18, 2012 noticed public meeting of the Mayor and Common Council for	Exhibit F to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller Decl., ¶ 9.
4	discussion concerning a declaration of fiscal emergency in the City and taking possible	
5	action on authorizing the filing of a petition under Chapter 9.	
6	9. A report entitled "City of San	Exhibit I to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller
7	Bernardino, California Staff Report" dated July 18, 2012 ("Staff Report") was prepared for the Mayor and Common Council	Decl. ¶ 10; Bush Decl. ¶ 15.
8	regarding the subject of a declaration of fiscal emergency.	
9	10. At the July 18, 2012 noticed public	Exhibit I to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller
10	meeting of the Mayor and Common Council concerning the fiscal condition of the City,	Decl. ¶ 9.
11	the Common Council was presented with an considered the Staff Report and public	
12	comments were taken.	
13	11. After the presentations and public comments that took place at the three	Exhibits G and H to Hanna Decl.; Travis-Miller Decl. ¶ 10.
14	noticed public meetings of the Mayor and Common Council held on July 10, July 16	Willief Deel.    10.
15	and July 18, 2012 concerning the fiscal condition of the City, a majority of the	
16	members of the Common Council voted to declare a fiscal emergency and approved a	
17	resolution finding that: (1) the City is or will be unable to pay its obligations within the	
18	next 60 days, and that the financial state of	
19	the City jeopardizes the health, safety or well-being of the residents of the City	
20	absent the protections of Chapter 9; and (2) given the City's dire financial condition, it	
21	was in the best interest of the City to declare a fiscal emergency. The Common Council	
22	also passed by a majority vote a resolution authorizing the filing of a petition under	
23	chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy Code.	
24	12. The City was specifically authorized under California law to be a chapter 9 debtor.	The evidence in paragraphs 3-11 above and that no party maintained an objection to eligibility on Section 109(c)(2) grounds
25	deotor.	eligibility on Section 109(c)(2) grounds.
26	13. A plan entitled "Fiscal Emergency Operating PlanJuly 2012 to September	Exhibits L and M to Hanna Decl.; Simpson Decl., ¶ 21; Busch Decl., ¶ 16.
27	2012" (the "Fiscal Emergency Plan") and a report entitled "City of San Bernardino selected Monthly Cash Flow Analysis	·> II
28	Science monthly Cush Flow Findings	

#### Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 4 of 12

1	Uncontroverted Facts	Evidence
2	Measures to Manage Cash" were prepared	Evidence
3	and presented for approval to the Mayor and Common Council on July 24, 2012.	
4	14. The Fiscal Emergency Plan was	Exhibit N to Hanna Dec.
5	approved by the Common Council on July 24, 2012.	
7 8	15. The City was insolvent within the meaning of Section 101(32)(c) of the Bankruptcy Code as of August 1, 2012.	No party maintained an objection to eligibility on Section 109(c)(3) grounds. Amended Statement of Qualifications under Section 109(c) [Docket No. 124].
9	16. The City filed its Amended Statement of Qualifications signed by the City Manager that states under penalty of perjury that the City desires to effect a plan to	Amended Statement of Qualifications Under Section 109(c) [Docket No. 124].
11	adjust its debts.	
12	17. A document entitled Pre-Pendency Plan was prepared and first presented to the	Busch III Decl. at ¶ 7 and Exhibit 2 thereto.
13	Common Council for consideration and approval at the meeting of the Mayor and	
14	Common Council conducted on August 30, 2012.	
15	18. In September 2012 and on October 1,	Busch III Decl. at ¶ 7 and Exhibit 1, 2 and 3.
16 17	2012, the Common Council approved the Pre-Pendency Plan as adjusted by a 9-Point Adjustment Plan.	3.
18	19. A document entitled Pendency Plan was prepared and first presented to the	Busch II Decl. at ¶ 5 and Exhibit 1 thereto.
19	Common Council at the meeting of the Mayor and Common Council conducted on	
20	November 19, 2012.	
21	20. The Common Council approved the Pendency Plan at the meeting of the Mayor	Busch III Decl. at ¶ 5 and Exhibit 1 thereto.
22	and Common Council conducted on November 26, 2012.	
23	21. On or about September 12, 2012, the	Declaration of Linda Daube In Support Of
24	City engaged Linda Daube to perform services for the City as the City's principal	Debtor City of San Bernardino's Motion Pursuant To 11 U.S.C. §§ 365, 901 And 904
25	representative and chief negotiator at all meet and confer sessions held with	For Order Approving: (A) Rejection Of Collective Bargaining Agreements With
26	representatives of the City's bargaining units. Linda Daube attended and	San Bernardino Public Employees Assoc., San Bernardino Police Officers Assoc. And
27	participated in meetings with representatives of the City's seven	San Bernardino City Professional Firefighters; And (B) February 1, 2013
28	bargaining units subsequent to September	Interim Modifications To Such Collective

1	Un controvented Foots	Evidonos
2	Uncontroverted Facts 12, 2012.	Evidence Bargaining Agreements [Docket No. 444]
3		("Daube Decl.") at ¶ 3.
4	22. The City reached agreements with four	Declaration Of Diana Leibrich In Support
5	of its seven unions (the General Bargaining	Of Debtor City Of San Bernardino's Motion
6	Unit, the Fire Management Bargaining Unit, the Police Management Bargaining Unit, and the Management/Confidential	Pursuant To 11 U.S.C. §§ 365, 901 And 904 For Order Approving: (A) Rejection Of Collective Bargaining Agreements With
7	Bargaining Unit) on modifications of the terms and conditions of employment to their	San Bernardino Public Employees Assoc., San Bernardino Police Officers Assoc. And
8	respective collective bargaining agreements, and those modifications took effect on	San Bernardino City Professional Firefighters; And (B) February 1, 2013
9	February 1, 2013 as set forth in Resolution	Interim Modifications To Such Collective
10	No. 2013-22, Resolution No. 2013-23, Resolution No. 2013-24, and Resolution No. 2013-25.	Bargaining Agreements [Docket No. 446] ("Leibrich Decl.") at ¶¶ 11-15 and Exhibits 17-20 thereto.
11	23. The City did not reach an agreement with three of its bargaining units on the	Leibrich Decl. at ¶¶ 16-19 and Exhibits 21-23 thereto; Daube Decl. at ¶ 13.
12	modifications of the terms and conditions of employment- the Middle Management Unit,	20 11101000, 2 0000 2 0011 00    121
13	the Police Safety Unit and the Fire Safety Unit. On January 28, 2013, the City	
14	Council voted to impose modifications to the terms and conditions of employment on	
15	these three bargaining units as set forth in Resolution No. 2013-18, Resolution No.	
16	2013-19, and Resolution No. 2013-20.	
17	24. At the meeting of the Mayor and Common Council conducted on April 22,	City Of San Bernardino's Report Respecting: (1) Approval Of Budgets for
18	2013, the City adopted its budget for the General Fund for fiscal years 2012-13 and	Fiscal Years 2012-13 And 2013-14 Further Implementing Pendency Plan; And (2)
19	2013-14.	Supplemental Update On City's Financial Condition; Declaration Of Michael Busch
20		In Support Thereof [Docket No. 572] ("Busch II Decl.") at ¶ 5 and Exhibit 1
21		thereto.
22	25. The City was unable to negotiate with creditors because such negotiation was	No party objected to eligibility on Section 109(c)(5) grounds. Amended Statement of
23	impracticable.	Qualifications under Section 109(c)
24	26. In March 2007, the City was provided with a study from Management Partners,	Bissett Decl. ¶ 5, Ex. A (page 3). This uncontroverted fact was found by the
25	Inc., noting the City's "fiscal distress,"	This uncontroverted fact was found by the court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4)
26	"significant and threatening unfunded liabilities," and "tenuous" general fund finances."	and Section 921 issues.
27		

# Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 6 of 12

1	TI ( ) IF (	F .1
2	Uncontroverted Facts  27. In March 2008, the City Manager	Evidence Bissett Decl. ¶ 7, Ex. C (page 1).
3	reported a projected \$7.2 million budget deficit.	This uncontroverted fact was found by the court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4) and Section 921 issues.
4	28. In February 2009, the Interim City	Bissett Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. D (page 1).
5	Manager reported a projected deficit of \$9.0 million for fiscal year 2008-2009, and a \$19.8 million deficit for fiscal year 2009-10.	This uncontroverted fact was found by the court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4) and Section 921 issues.
6		
7	29. In early 2009, the City fire chief and police chief submitted reports with cost-	Bissett Decl. ¶¶ 9-10, Exs. E & F. This uncontroverted fact was found by the
8 9	cutting recommendations, including layoffs, but those recommendations were not adopted.	court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4) and Section 921 issues.
9	30. During the meeting of the Mayor and	Bissett Decl. ¶ 11.
10	Common Council on August 23, 2010, the Treasurer noted the possibility of	This uncontroverted fact was found by the court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4)
11	bankruptcy if the City continued its "accounting tricks" and did not close its deficit.	and Section 921 issues.
13	31. During the meeting of the Mayor and Common Council on August 23, 2010, the	Bissett Decl. ¶ 11, Ex. G. This uncontroverted fact was found by the
14	City's Finance Director presented a PowerPoint Slide entitled "Symptoms of	court to be irrelevant to Section 109(c)(4) and Section 921 issues.
16	Bankruptcy."	
	32. The City's Finance Department issued a	Decl. Simpson [Dkt. No. 127] ¶ 6.
17	report entitled "San Bernardino Budgetary Analysis and Recommendations for Budget	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
18	Stabilization" on July 9, 2012 (the "Budget Report"). The Budget Report projected that	
19	the City's General Fund balance would be a negative \$10.6 million by June 30, 2012.	
20		
21	33. At the July 18, 2012 meeting of the Common Council, the Common Council adopted resolutions dealering a fixed	Bissett Decl. ¶¶ 14-15, Exs. J-K.
22	adopted resolutions declaring a fiscal emergency and directing that a chapter 9	
23	petition "shall be filed." The Common Council resolutions authorizing the Petition	
24	say nothing about a plan of adjustment or let a "desire to effect" a plan of adjustment.	
25		

26

27

# Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 7 of 12

1		
	<b>Uncontroverted Facts</b>	Evidence
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	34. Nearly a year after the City filed its Petition, it has failed to file a plan of	Busch Dep. at 268:18-272:4.
4	adjustment, set forth the terms of a plan of adjustment, or formulate so much as an outline of an eventual plan of adjustment.	
5	As of May 2013, no one at the City had been assigned the task of creating a plan of	
6	adjustment.	
7	35. At the time the City filed its Petition, it had no concept or outline of a plan of adjustment.	See Busch Dep. at 268:18-272:4.
8		
9   10	36. The City did not negotiate with its principal creditors prior to filing its Petition	See July 31, 2013 Declaration of Corey W. Glave filed concurrently herewith, ¶¶ 2-4;
11	on Aug. 1, 2012 and has not engaged in meaningful postpetition negotiations with	February 8, 2013 Declaration of Bonnie E. Clarke [Dkt. No. 401-3], ¶¶ 10, 13; March
12	its creditors regarding the terms of a plan of adjustment.	21, 2013 Declaration of Dennis J. Hayes [Dkt. 498-1], ¶¶ 12-13, 28-30; February 26, 2013 Declaration of Michael A. McGill
13		[Dkt. No. 424-2], ¶¶ 17-21, 24.
14	37. The City did not formulate a pendency plan until November 26, 2012.	See Declaration of Michael Busch Re City of San Bernardino's Pendency Plan [Dkt.
15 16		No. 234], Ex. 1; CalPERS' Preliminary Objection [Dkt. No. 207] at 9.
17		
18	38. The City has not submitted any evidence that it ever explored alternatives to bankruptcy, other than those included in the	Minutes of the July 10, 2012 council meeting (where bankruptcy was authorized) reflect that the City did not evaluate
19	Budget Report of July 9, 2012.	alternatives such as access to the capital markets or asset sales. <i>See</i> Bissett Decl. ¶
20		13, Ex. I. The Budget Report of July 9, 2012 Minutes of City Council July 10, 2012
21	39. The City's Pendency plan is 10 pages long, contains no detailed supporting	meeting. Hanna Decl. Exhibits B and C.  See Pendency Plan [Dkt. No. 234-2].
22	financial information, and is premised on a postpetition budget which deferred	
23	postpetition expenses.	
24   25		
26	40. The City had inadequate resources in its	Bissett Decl., ¶ 5, Ex. A (page 2); id. ¶ 6,
27	finance department at the time it filed its bankruptcy case and the City's finance	Ex. B (Busch Dep. At 257:17-261:5). Williams Decl. [Dkt. No. 282] ¶¶ 7-8.
28	department remains understaffed.	- " "

# Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 8 of 12

1		
	Uncontroverted Facts	Evidence
2	41. The City did not produce to CalPERS its reconciled bank account statements until	Crisafulli Decl. ¶¶ 16-17.
3 4	late January and early February 2013, and did not prepare cash forecasts until April 2013.	
5	2013.	
	42. The City, since filing its Petition, has	See March 21, 2013 Declaration of Dennis
6	not provided all requested financial information to its creditors and parties in	J. Hayes [Dkt. No. 498-1], ¶¶ 15-24; see also July 10, 2013 Declaration of Corey W.
8	interest.	Glave [Dkt. 686, p. 11 of 298], ¶¶ 8. Decl. Crisafulli ¶¶ 15-18.
9	43. The City has failed to provide CalPERS	Decl. Crisafulli ¶¶ 13-18.
10	with some financial data it has requested during the pendency of the City's case.	
11	44. During the 90 days before filing its bankruptcy petition, the City paid some \$2	Bissett Decl. ¶ 16, Ex. L (Reuters article); Crisafulli Decl. ¶ 23.
12	million as "cashouts" to employees and newly retiring employees, including nearly	
13	\$1.2 million in July (\$600,000 of which was paid on the day before it filed its Petition).	
14		
15	45. The City has made payments on prepetition debt post-filing while it continues to not pay some postpetition	Busch Dep. at 265:9-268:17
16	creditors.	
17 18	46. The City has failed to timely pay millions of dollars in postpetition	Crisafulli Decl. ¶¶ 20-21; Busch Decl. of April 29 [Dkt. No. 572-6].
	obligations.	
19 20		
	47. The City knew of the underlying	See generally Galipo Decl.
21	settlements in the three civil rights cases	0 I
22	months before filing its Petition.	
23	48. The audited annual financial report for	Decl. Crisafulli ¶ 12.
24	the City's Water Department reflects that at the time the City filed its Petition, the City's	The Court determined as a matter of law that the City could not use any of the
25	Water Department held over \$37,000,000 in immediately available cash and cash	Water Department funds as general fund monies nor could it borrow from the Water
26	equivalents which were not designated as restricted. The City has set forth no	Department.
27	evidence indicating that it considered borrowing money from the Water	
28	Department to address its liquidity concerns.	

#### Case 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 9 of 12

<b>Uncontroverted Facts</b>	Evidence
49. The City's Water Department had total net assets in the amount of \$263 million as of the Petition date.	Decl. Crisafulli ¶ 12.  The Court determined as a matter of law that the City could not use any of the Water Department funds as general fund monies nor could it borrow from the Water Department.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Court's conclusions of law on the City's Motion for Summary Judgment on Eligibility for Chapter 9 Relief (the "Motion") were made by the Court on the record at the hearing on August 28, 2013, and will be reflected in the Court's forthcoming written opinion on its ruling on the City's Motion.

###

Date: September 17, 2013

Meredith A. Jury
United States Bankruptcy Judge

#### NOTICE OF ENTERED ORDER AND SERVICE LIST

2		
2		

1

Notice is given by the court that a judgment or order entitled (specify): CALPERS' STATEMENT OF UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW was entered on the date indicated as "Entered" on the first page of this judgment or order and will be served in the manner stated below:

4

5

1. SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF) B Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBRs, the foregoing document was served on the following persons by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the judgment or order. As of (date)\_\_09/11/13\_\_, the following persons are currently on the Electronic Mail Notice List for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below.

7

6

Jerrold Abeles abeles.jerry@arentfox.com, labarreda.vivian@arentfox.com

8

Franklin C Adams franklin.adams@bbklaw.com, arthur.johnston@bbklaw.com;lisa.spencer@bbklaw.com;bknotices@bbklaw.com Joseph M Adams jadams@adamspham.com

9

Andrew K Alper aalper@frandzel.com, efiling@frandzel.com;ekidder@frandzel.com

10

Thomas V Askounis taskounis@askounisdarcy.com Julie A Belezzuoli julie.belezzuoli@kayescholer.com

11

Anthony Bisconti tbisconti@bmkattorneys.com, admin@bmkattorneys.com

Brett Bissett brett.bissett@klgates.com,

carolyn.orphey@klgates.com;klgatesbankruptcy@klgates.com Brett Bissett brett.bissett@klgates.com,

carolyn.orphey@klgates.com;klgatesbankruptcy@klgates.com Jeffrey E Bjork ibjork@sidley.com

- Michael D Boutell mdbell@comerica.com
- J Scott Bovitz bovitz@bovitz-spitzer.com

John A Boyd fednotice@tclaw.net Jeffrey W Broker ibroker@brokerlaw.biz

- Deana M Brown dbrown@milbank.com
- Michael J Bujold Michael J. Bujold @usdoj.gov

Shirley Cho scho@pszilaw.com

- Alicia Clough alicia.clough@kayescholer.com, managingattorneyofficeassignments@kayescholer.com
- Marc S Cohen mcohen@kayescholer.com, dhernandez@kayescholer.com

19 Ronald R Cohn rcohn@horganrosen.com

- Christopher H Conti chc@sdlaborlaw.com, sak@sdlaborlaw.com
- Christopher J Cox chris.cox@weil.com, janine.chong@weil.com

Christina M Craige ccraige@sidley.com

Alex Darcy adarcy@askounisdarcy.com, akapai@askounisdarcy.com

Susan S Davis sdavis@coxcastle.com

- Robert H Dewberry robert.dewberry@dewlaw.net Todd J Dressel dressel@chapman.com, lubecki@chapman.com
- Chrysta L Elliott elliottc@ballardspahr.com, manthiek@ballardspahr.com
  - Scott Ewing contact@omnimgt.com, sewing@omnimgt.com;katie@omnimgt.com

John A Farmer jfarmer@orrick.com

Brian W Freeman brian@pedigolaw.com, brian@brianwfreeman.com

Victoria C Geary victoria geary@boe.ca.gov

Paul R. Glassman pglassman@sycr.com Robert P Goe kmurphy@goeforlaw.com, rgoe@goeforlaw.com;mforsythe@goeforlaw.com

David M Goodrich dgoodrich@marshackhays.com, ecfmarshackhays@gmail.com

Christian Graham cgraham23@dlblaw.net

Everett L Green everett.l.green@usdoj.gov

- Chad V Haes chaes@marshackhays.com, ecfmarshackhays@gmail.com
- James A Hayes jhayes@jamesahayesaplc.com

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

1	M Jonathan Hayes jhayes@srhlawfirm.com,
2	roksana@srhlawfirm.com;carolyn@srhlawfirm.com;shawnj@srhlawfirm.com;rosarioz@srhlawfirm.com;jhayesecf@gmail.com;j@alkazian.com
	D Edward Hays ehays@marshackhays.com, ecfmarshackhays@gmail.com
3	<ul> <li>Eric M Heller eric.m.heller@irscounsel.treas.gov</li> <li>Jeffery D Hermann jhermann@orrick.com</li> </ul>
4	Jeffery D Hermann jhermann@orrick.com
_	Bonnie M Holcomb bonnie.holcomb@doj.ca.gov, rosita.eduardo@doj.ca.gov
5	<ul> <li>Whitman L Holt wholt@ktbslaw.com</li> <li>Michelle C Hribar mch@sdlaborlaw.com</li> </ul>
6	Steven J Katzman SKatzman@bmkattorneys.com, admin@bmkattorneys.com
_	Jane Kespradit ane.kespradit alimruger.com, amy.lee@limruger.com
7	<ul> <li>Mette H Kurth kurth.mette@arentfox.com</li> <li>Mette H Kurth kurth.mette@arentfox.com</li> </ul>
8	Sandra W Lavigna lavignas@sec.gov
	Michael B Lubic michael.lubic@klgates.com, jonathan.randolph@klgates.com
9	<ul> <li>Michael B Lubic michael.lubic@klgates.com, jonathan.randolph@klgates.com</li> <li>Richard A Marshack rmarshack@marshackhays.com,</li> </ul>
10	lbergini@marshackhays.com;ecfmarshackhays@gmail.com
	David J McCarty dmccarty@sheppardmullin.com
11	<ul> <li>Reed M Mercado rmercado@sheppardmullin.com</li> <li>Fred Neufeld fneufeld@sycr.com</li> </ul>
12	Aron M Oliner roliner@duanemorris.com
12	Scott H Olson solson@seyfarth.com
13	<ul> <li>Dean G Rallis drallis@sulmeyerlaw.com</li> <li>Christopher O Rivas crivas@reedsmith.com</li> </ul>
14	Kenneth N Russak krussak@frandzel.com, efiling@frandzel.com;dmoore@frandzel.com
1.5	Gregory M Salvato @salvatolawoffices.com, calendar@salvatolawoffices.com
15	<ul> <li>Mark C Schnitzer mschnitzer@rhlaw.com, mcschnitzer@gmail.com</li> <li>William R Shafton wshafton@winston.com</li> </ul>
16	Diane S Shaw diane.shaw@doj.ca.gov
17	Ariella T Simonds asimonds@sidley.com
17	<ul> <li>Leonard Steiner ls@steinerlibo.com, jasoncarter@steinerlibo.com;aam@steinerlibo.com</li> <li>Jason D Strabo jstrabo@mwe.com, LosAngelesTrialDocket@mwe.com</li> </ul>
18	Cathy Ta cathy.ta@bbklaw.com, Arthur.Johnston@bbklaw.com;lisa.spencer@bbklaw.com
19	Sheila Totorp stotorp@clausen.com, jbrzezinski@clausen.com  Panionia P. Trachtman htmanhtmanhtmanhtmanham agent set achtmanham age
19	<ul> <li>Benjamin R Trachtman btrachtman@trachtmanlaw.com, sstraka@trachtmanlaw.com</li> <li>Matthew J Troy matthew.troy@usdoj.gov</li> </ul>
20	United States Trustee (RS) ustpregion16.rs.ecf@usdoj.gov
21	<ul> <li>Anne A Uyeda auyeda@bmkattorneys.com</li> <li>Annie Verdries verdries@lbbslaw.com, Autodocket@lbbslaw.com</li> </ul>
21	<ul> <li>Annie Verdries werdries@ibbslaw.com, Autodocket@ibbslaw.com</li> <li>Brian D Wesley brian.wesley@doj.ca.gov</li> </ul>
22	Kirsten A. Worley kw@wlawcorp.com, admin@wlawcorp.com
23	<ul> <li>Clarisse Young youngshumaker@psmlawyers.com, sally@psmlawyers.com</li> <li>Pamela Jan Zylstra zylstralaw@gmail.com</li> </ul>
23	Tameta Jan Zyisti a Zyisti alawa ginan.com
24	
25	☐ Service information continued on
26	attached page
26	2. SERVED BY THE COURT VIA UNITED STATES MAIL: A copy of this notice and a true copy of this
27	judgment or order was sent by United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, to the following persons and/or
28	entities at the addresses indicated below:
_	<u>Debtor</u>
	I and the second se

C	se 6:12-bk-28006-MJ Doc 796 Filed 09/17/13 Entered 09/17/13 15:33:46 Desc Main Document Page 12 of 12
1	City of San Bernardino, California, City Hall, 300 North "D" Street, San Bernardino, CA 92418-0001
2	Service information continued on attached page
3	
4	3. TO BE SERVED BY THE LODGING PARTY: Within 72 hours after receipt of a copy of this judgment or
5	order which bears an "Entered" stamp, the party lodging the judgment or order will serve a complete copy bearing an "Entered" stamp by United States mail, overnight mail, facsimile transmission or email and file a
6	proof of service of the entered order on the following persons and/or entities at the addresses, facsimile transmission numbers, and/or email addresses stated below:
7	
8	
9	
10	☐ Service information continued on attached page
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	